

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. In a previous response, the Applicant amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. The Applicant has not amended, canceled or added any claims in the present response. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,760,324 to Scott, *et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,116 to Vander Meiden. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner recognizes that Scott does not teach or suggest extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call from calling number identification signals received from a circuit-switched telephone network via a first telephone call as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner cites Vander Meiden. (*See Examiner's Action*, pages 2-3.) Vander Meiden relates to automatically detecting pending area code changes and updating speed dialing lists, routing tables, and the like in telecommunications systems. (*See column 1, lines 9-11.*) Vander Meiden discloses extracting a called or terminating party's telephone number from a received call connect message. (*See column 5, lines 11-21, and Figure 5.*)

The terminating party's telephone number is not, however, a destination address for a subsequent telephone call as asserted by the Examiner. (*See Examiner's Action*, page 3.) On the contrary, the terminating party's telephone number is a telephone number of the called party of the just connected telephone call. Thus, the extracted terminating party's telephone number is not a

destination address for a subsequent call but is a telephone number from a call that is already connected. It is not used for a subsequent call but is used to compare to an already stored number for the called party to determine if an area code change is pending. (See column 5, lines 20-25, and Figure 5.) As such, Vander Meiden as applied does not cure the noted deficiencies of Scott.

Accordingly, Scott and Vander Meiden, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call from calling number identification signals received from a circuit-switched telephone network via a first telephone call as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. The Applicant, therefore, also does not find where the combination of Scott and Vander Meiden teaches or suggests employing the destination address to automatically initiate the subsequent telephone call to the destination address via a computer network as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Since Scott and Vander Meiden do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15, the cited combination of Scott and Vander Meiden does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1, 8 and 15 and Claims dependent thereon. As such, Claims 1-21 are not unpatentable in view of Scott and Vander Meiden. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the \$103 rejection with respect to Claims 1-21 and allow issuance thereof.

Furthermore, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Vander Meiden with Scott. On the contrary, Scott is directed to providing voice over the Internet communication. (See Abstract.) Vander Meiden, on the other hand, is directed to automatically detecting pending area code changes when the new area code or the existing area code may be used to dial a particular number. (See column 1, lines 63-67.)


II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-21.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: June 2, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800